Case 2:23-cv-00806-MCE-KJN Document 35 Filed 10/19/23 Page 1 of 3

1 2 3 4 5	BURSOR & FISHER, P.A. Stefan Bogdanovich (State Bar No. 324525) Brittany S. Scott (State Bar No. 327132) 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 E-mail: sbogdanovich@bursor.com bscott@bursor.com	
6	BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.	
7	Philip L. Fraietta (admitted pro hac vice) 1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor	
8	New York, NY 10019 Telephone: (646) 837-7150	
9	Facsimile: (212) 989-9163 E-Mail: pfraietta@bursor.com	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
11		
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13		
14 15	CALVIN LINCOLN III, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No. 2:23-cv-00806-MCE
16	Plaintiff,	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF AND
17	V.	ORDER TO ACCEPT PLAINTIFF'S
18	MX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	OMNIBUS OPPOSITION BRIEF AS FILED
19	Defendant.	Judge: Hon. Morrison C. England, Jr.
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO ACCEPT PLAINTIFF'S OMNIBUS OPPOSITION BRIEF AS FILED CASE NO. 2:23-CV-00806-MCE

Case 2:23-cv-00806-MCE-KJN Document 35 Filed 10/19/23 Page 2 of 3

Plaintiff's counsel erroneously filed one 25-page brief opposing Defendant's two separate motions (to transfer and dismiss, ECF Nos. 25 and 26), mistakenly believing it was within the page limit. Plaintiff's counsel acknowledge their error and recognize that they should have consulted the Court's Initial Pre-Trial Scheduling Order. Nonetheless, pursuant to Local Rule 233, Plaintiff's counsel respectfully request the Court accept the brief as filed, given that Plaintiff's 25-page omnibus opposition is below the 40 pages Plaintiff is allotted for two separate opposition briefs.

Defendant opposes Plaintiff's request and takes the position that Plaintiff's brief should be stricken. Should the Court agree, Plaintiff proposes that he be given leave to split his omnibus opposition into two briefs, one responding to the motion to transfer, and the other responding to the motion to dismiss. Both briefs, combined, would be the same, approximately 25 pages. Plaintiff believes efficiency favors the submission of one 25-page omnibus brief, but will, of course, defer to the Court's directive.

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

Dated: October 19, 2023

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.

By: /s/ Stefan Bogdanovich
Stefan Bogdanovich

Stefan Bogdanovich (State Bar No. 324525) Brittany S. Scott (State Bar No. 327132) 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700

E-mail: sbogdanovich@bursor.com bscott@bursor.com

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.

Philip L. Fraietta (*admitted pro hac vice*) 1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor New York, NY 10019

Telephone: (646) 837-7150 Facsimile: (212) 989-9163 E-Mail: pfraietta@bursor.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ORDER

Having considered the Plaintiff's motion for administrative relief, the Court accepts Plaintiff's omnibus opposition brief (ECF No. 32), as filed. Defendant may choose to file either one omnibus reply brief or two separate briefs corresponding to each original Motion.

The parties are advised, however, that this Court does not have the time or the patience to entertain disputes over such insubstantial minutiae. Counsel of the caliber appearing in this case should know not to dig their heels in over every disagreement. Plaintiff's combined twenty-five (25) page opposition is fifteen (15) pages shorter than would be allowed if separate oppositions were filed. Defendant may not like it, but that saves the Court time, which is greatly appreciated in this district. In any event, even if separate briefs would together have been limited to twenty-five (25) pages, the Court fails to see how Plaintiff presenting his arguments in one or two briefs matters in the slightest. There is simply no prejudice to Defendant in having to reply in either one combined or two separate briefs, depending on its preference.

Accordingly, counsel are admonished that the Court will not look kindly on having to referee such trivial arguments going forward. In addition, if counsel prefer to avoid sanctions down the road, they would be wise to find a way to work together to litigate this case both professionally and efficiently.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 19, 2023

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE